DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 464 CS 506 618

AUTHOR Keyton, Joann
TITLE Evaluating Group Satisfaction as a Situational Variable.
PUB DATE Apr 89
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association (Louisville, KY, April 6-8, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Communication Research; *Group Behavior; Group Membership; Higher Education; Sharing Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; Group Attitudes; Group Characteristics; *Group Data; *Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

A study of group member satisfaction investigated which communication behaviors satisfy and dissatisfy people in their group experiences, and whether satisfaction and dissatisfaction are bi-polar opposites or are two crucially different variables. The baseline data generated in this project, which included the participation of 20 upper-grade undergraduate subjects studying group communication, provided the initial elements in developing measuring instruments to aid in identifying, defining, and explaining group member satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Results confirmed that the three variables identified by R. Heslin and D. Dunphy (1964) are important factors contributing to satisfaction. The data generated here, however, offer evidence contrary to the general assumption suggested by P. J. Marston and M. L. Hecht (1988) that dissatisfaction is the logical and numerical opposite of satisfaction. These data also suggest that, on the whole, satisfaction is a global attribute as long as the group is moving in its expected direction. Also, the greater variation identified in the dissatisfaction factors in the testing of the situational items suggests that researchers need to consider a two-step approach to measuring group member satisfaction. (Five tables of data and five appendixes containing questionnaires are included.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309464

EVALUATING GROUP SATISFACTION

AS A SITUATIONAL VARIABLE

Joann Keyton
Assistant Professor
Department of Communication
University of South Alabama
Alpha East 325
Mobile, AL 36688
(205) 460-6301

Top Three Paper presented to the Communication Theory Division, Southern States Communication Association, Annual Convention, Louisville, KY, April 1989.

CS506618

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joann Keyton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

EVALUATING GROUP SATISFACTION AS A SITUATIONAL VARIABLE

Satisfaction has long been a variable of interest to communication researchers. Unfortunately, our research has done little to adequately define, explain, or measure the concept in the group context. To this point there are three major lines of satisfaction research. The first and last specifically focus on satisfaction in group situations, but the second line which emphasizes the dyadic context has received most of the empirical validation.

Heslin and Dunphy (1964) summarize the first major thrust which focuses on member satisfaction with the group. They reviewed over 450 small group studies, most from the social psychology perspective, published from 1955 to 1962. Their review resulted in 37 studies which specifically identified the group member satisfaction construct. From these studies, three major variables were identified that could be operationally defined and which accounted for a major proportion of variance associated with small group member satisfaction. These three variables are: 1) status consensus; 2) perceived progress toward group goal; and 3) perceived freedom to participate. These researchers indicated that while the three variables played major roles in group member satisfaction, analysis of satisfaction had to take into account the important aspect of situational differences.

Prior to the second major line of research, two separate investigations of group member satisfaction appeared. Gouran (1973) investigated satisfaction as a correlate of group

variables other than network position and cohesiveness. Social psychology and sociometric research had already identified network centrality and cohesiveness as key factors that affect one's satisfaction with group discussion. Gouran's results identified perception of the quality of other group members' contribution as having the strongest relationship to a member's satisfaction with the group discussion. "Perception of the quality of his own performance did not contribute substantially to his self-assessed level of satisfaction, and frequency of participation appeared to be almost totally unrelated" (Gouran, 1973, p. 93).

Even though these results are intriguing--satisfaction with group discussion is more incumbent on the evaluation of others' performance rather than evaluation of one's own performance--satisfaction was measured non-specifically. Subjects were asked simply: "How satisfied were you with the group's overall performance?" (Gouran, 1973, p. 92). This type of measurement clouds the conceptual nature and does little to advance or specify the operational definition of satisfaction.

At about the same time, Hrycenko and Minton (1974) investigated satisfaction in task oriented groups from the social psychology perspective by looking for specific factors that contributed to satisfaction. Their investigation yielded five factors that contributed to overall satisfaction: 1) satisfaction with the task procedure chosen by the group leader, 2) feelings of independence in the performance of personal tasks within the group situation, 3) concern with personal effectiveness, and two other factors that generally identified

the subjects' interest in the experiment itself.

The first factor accounted for 25.4% of the variance and was defined as two subdimensions: 1) satisfaction with the method of working; and 2) satisfaction with the leader who chose this method of working. The second and third factors accounted for 14.9% and 13.5% of the total variance, respectively. This experiment looks at satisfaction more specifically, yet the word "satisfaction" was used in two of the seven questions. Asking someone to respond on a scale to the question "In general, how satisfied were you with the leader?" or "In performing your job, how satisfied were you with the amount of independence that the leader gave you?" (Hrycenko & Minton, 1974, p. 875) does little to suggest what specifically is satisfying to group members with the group's leadership.

Research at this stage is still nebulous in terms of conceptualizing and operationally defining group member satisfaction. This type of research treats the variable of satisfaction in a global nature implicating that it's not what is satisfying that is important. Rather, research on group satisfaction is more concerned if group members feel satisfied or not.

The second major line of satisfaction research comes from the interpersonal perspective and is concentrated in the work of Hecht (1978a, 1978b, 1978c, & 1984) and Marston and Hecht (1988). Hecht's (1978c) first article reviews the conceptualization of satisfaction from the perspectives of need gratification, expectation fulfillment, equivocality reduction, constraint-

reinforcement, and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. His review details the basic assumptions about the causality of satisfaction and other variable relationships with satisfaction. In each of the perspectives, Hecht (1978c) identifies "a link between the internal state and the environment, and affect associated with the link" (p. 54).

Based upon his comparison of the various perspectives and conceptualizations, Hecht (1978c) develops the discrimination fulfillment approach to communication satisfaction. From this perspective,

> communication satisfaction is an internal, secondary reinforcer arising from the generalization of environmental reinforcement of behaviors manifested in response to the presence of a discriminative stimulus. This position maintains that persons develop standards by which to judge their world (discriminations, positive expectations, positive anticipations). (p. 59)

The central contribution of Hecht's discriminative fulfillment conceptualization of satisfaction is that it grounds satisfaction with communication and in communication behavior itself.

From this base, Hecht (1978b) developed a 19-item unidimensional inventory of interpersonal communication satisfaction (Com-Sat Inventory). The questionnaire exhibited high reliability and validity in trials measuring communication satisfaction in actual and recalled dyadic conversations. The items that loaded in the primary factor on oblique rotation are

marked with an asterisk (*) and shown with all the other items in Appendix A. The first factor accounted for 45.5% of the variance and was labeled as "general affect/morale" reflecting a global satisfaction response to a conversation. A second factor accounting for 3.9% of the total variance was labeled "substance/salience" and reflects a person's reaction to the content of the conversation. A third factor accounting for only 2.8% of the variance is labeled "free interaction" and reflects the openness of the communication system.

Hecht, however, interpreted these findings as a unidimensional construct because the three factors together accounted for only 52.2% of the variance without a clear factor structure emerging. Further testing revealed that all 19 items were superior to a shorter version. In total, the items combine to make an extremely reliable and valid instrument to measure satisfaction in interpersonal communication in social settings regardless of the acquaintance history of the dyadic partners. Use of this instrument in communication research indicates that the Com-Sat Inventory has become the standard for measuring interpersonal communication satisfaction. Although some of the Com-Sat items could be used to measure group member satisfaction, interaction in the group context certainly adds additional "group" factors that would contribute to or take away from member satisfaction.

From this developmental point, Hecht (1978a) reviews measures of communication satisfaction in separate contexts. While

> satisfaction is typically conceived of as the affective response to the fulfillment of expectation-type standards and symbols an enjoyable, fulfilling experience. . . . satisfaction relates conceptually to expectations which differ in various contexts and this organizational framework suggests the beginnings of a contextual approach to communication satisfaction. (pp. 350-531)

Hecht (1978a) critiques the attempts to measure group communication satisfaction and identifies the following problems: 1) there is no measure of group communication satisfaction; 2) ambiguity hampers the move from conceptualization to measurement; and 3) satisfaction has frequently been equated to liking and other global emotional responses. These problems point to validity issues in measuring group communication satisfaction. What variables contribute to satisfaction? Is satisfaction the opposite of dissatisfaction? Methodologically, Hecht acknowledges that researchers need to be concerned with satisfaction being measured at the expectation fulfillment level. From this perspective, maximum return is not specified; thus, we have a problem knowing if zero satisfaction is the same as dissatisfaction.

Hecht furthers his critique by indicating that group satisfaction measures are generally constructed for specific studies and typically tend to be attitude type scales. A second problem exists in that many communication researchers use single item scales to indicate satisfaction. "Researchers have

typically studied some variable in the group process and used satisfaction as an indicator of its effect. Group satisfaction has been studied almost exclusively as a dependent variable in experiments primarily designed to study another variable" (Hecht, 1978a, pp. 358-359). Satisfaction used experimentally as a dependent variable and measured globally has hampered the development and acceptance of an instrument to measure group communication satisfaction. Hecht concludes "researchers interested in this area would do well to construct group satisfaction measures from a zero base. Items should be constructed from respondents' perceptions and observational studies and tested and factor analyzed, and reliability and validity information generated" (1978a, p. 360).

More recently, Marston and Hecht (1988) have defined satisfaction as "a holistic, affective response to the success of behaviors that are selected based upon expectations" (p. 236). This definition is not restricted to the group context. Viewing group member satisfaction as part of the larger socio-emotional outcome of group performance, Marston and Hecht identify six factors that contribute to group satisfaction. They are: group participation, types of messages, feedback, interaction management, status, and motivation. No evidence is presented that these factors work simultaneously toward satisfaction; and, a measuring instrument is not presented.

The third line of satisfaction research is aimed directly at the group context and is the only research that has resulted in a group satisfaction instrument. Wall and his colleagues (Wall &

Galanes, 1986; Wall, Galanes, & Love, 1987; Wall & Nolan, 1986; and Wall & Nolan, 1987) have used a Likert-type scale to measure satisfaction with group interaction as a correlate to perceived amount of conflict, perceived inequity, and quality of outcome. Three versions of the scale (9, 10 and 12 items) include both process- and product-related questions to generate an overall index of satisfaction for each subject. Reported trials of the instrument indicate that the instrument has high internal reliability, but questionable discriminant validity

While the Wall instrument (see Appendix B) is a step in the right direction because it targets satisfaction in group interaction, there is some question as to what constructs the instrument taps. Questions are framed in three ways: 1) attitudinal; 2) direct reference to being satisfied; and 3) direct reference to being frustrated. There are three criticisms: 1) we do not know if frustration is the same as dissatisfaction; 2) it is uncertain that dissatisfaction is the polar opposite of satisfaction; and 3) none of the questionnaire items focus on self or other communication behaviors. Keyton (1987) used the instrument as a criterion variable with group compatibility as the predictor variable. No significant differences were found among the types of group compatibility. Again, it may not be enough to ask if one is satisfied or, conversely, if one is frustrated. What makes one satisfied or frustrated with the group process and task may be better questions to ask.

Literature Review Summary

If one takes a look at the number of times the satisfaction variable is included in group research and mentioned in group texts, one would conclude that it is a critical component of group interaction. Unfortunately, research has not been conducted from a baseline that provides real evidence of which communication behaviors satisfy and dissatisfy people in their group experiences. Second, research has not distinguished if satisfaction and dissatisfaction are bi-polar opposites or that the two are crucially different variables. The study of group member satisfaction that follows is a beginning to a long-range plan of research that intends to answer some of these critical inquiries.

Baseline Generation of Data

Twenty upper undergraduate subjects studying group communication were asked to participate in the data generation step. These subjects had self-selected themselves into task groups to pursue group grades that accounted for over half of their final course grade. After three weeks of group interaction, each subject was asked to respond to two open ended requests: 1) write a paragraph or so about what makes you satisfied with your group; and 2) write a paragraph or so about what makes you dissatisfied with your group. The paragraphs were content coded by phrase or sentence units by the researcher resulting in 57 separate satisfying phrases and 45 separate dissatisfying phrases.

Each phrase was converted into sentence format and typed on an index card. Next, the 20 subjects who generated the

statements and 30 additional undergraduate subjects sorted the 102 cards into four categories after being given the following instructions:

> Thinking back over your past group experiences, I'd like for you to look at these cards and sort them into four categories: 1) things that satisfy you in a group; 2) things that dissatisfy you in a group; 3) things that are neutral--they could satisfy or dissatisfy depending upon the situation; and 4) things that have nothing to do with satisfaction at all. There are no right or wrong answers; I'm interested in what satisfies or dissatisfies you in group situations.

After each student sorted the cards, the cards were marked as to the category in which they were placed, shuffled, and readied for the next student.

The sorting distribution was analyzed for reliability by looking at the percentage of time the phrases were sorted into the same categories. The researcher determined that if a card was sorted 70% to 90% of the time into one category it represented a stable satisfying or dissatisfying variable. Because the researcher did not prescribe the situational element for the subjects prior to sorting, it is expected that they included many different group situations in their recall. As a result, 43 items were sorted and identified as being satisfiers; 27 items were sorted and identified as being dissatisfiers. With

this many items being consistently sorted in a non-specific stimulus condition, it appears that there are some universal attributes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. See Appendix C for the phrases and their sort frequencies.

Analyzing Group Satisfaction as as Situational Variable

Because the situational nature of the satisfaction construct had been previously suggested and experimentally overlooked, the next step in this research program focuses on those phrases that did not fit into consistent satisfaction or dissatisfaction sort categories.

The sorting procedure identified 32 potentially situational phrases. Of these 32, 28 did not meet the 70% consistent sort criterion. For these items, at least 30% of the sorts fell into the "neutral" or "has nothing to do with satisfaction" categories. Of the 28, 13 were originally generated as satisfiers and 15 were originally generated as dissatisfiers. Two additional items did not meet either the 70% satisfaction/dissatisfaction or 30% criteria neutral/nothing to do with satisfaction and were also included in the situational testing. Two items--one a satisfier and one a dissatifier--included in the original data generation set, but lost during sorting procedures were also included in the situational testing set of items. (See Appendix D.)

These 32 items were alternately combined into one set of items (Appendix D). Three different situational stories were written to highlight different group elements that should have an effect on group member satisfaction. Situation one was written to implicate long-term group history and long-term future

involvement; situation two was written to suggest a zero-history situation with the opportunity for long-term future involvement; and situation three was written to identify a group situation with zero-history, short-term group interaction, and no plan for extended interaction. These three situations are shown in Appendix E. The set of 32 situational items was paired to all three stories to produce three separate questionnaires.

A different pool of subjects were asked to respond to each set of items for each of the three situations. They received one set of questions at a time, generally with at least 48 hours between each set. Subjects were asked to read the situation and imagine that they were the group member identified in the story. Responses were made on a seven point Likert-type scale. Responses at one end of the scale indicated that the item would increase their satisfaction in the group; the opposite end of the scale was anchored to indicate that the item would decrease their satisfaction with the group. The middle range of the scale was used to indicate that the item would have no effect on their satisfaction with the group. Forty students completed all three questionnaires.

The initial descriptive statistics generated for each questionnaire were discouraging. The mean totals of satisfiers and dissatisfiers appeared to indicate that there were no situational differences for these items (see Table 1).

Table 1

Cumulative Descriptive Statistics

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation
Situation 1 Dissatisfiers	93.975	10.167
Situation 2 Dissatisfiers	93.000	11.516
Situation 3 Dissatisfiers	93.550	11.673
Situation 1 Satisfiers	73.825	8.089
Situation 2 Satisfiers	72.075	8.247
Situation 2 Satisfiers	72.375	7.679

min. sat. = 14; max. sat. = 98
min. dis. = 18; max. dis. = 126
n = 40

Further item-by-item investigation revealed, however, that although the cumulative totals were consistent, that items were varying among the three situations.

First, item means were examined. While all items responded in their expected direction, some items did fall below the midpoint of the response scale (4.0). These items were identified as neutral items because the midpoint range response was anchored by the words "no effect on your satisfaction with the group." Removing these four positive items (9, 11, 15, & 17) from the item set for each situational questionnaire adjusted the total sum, mean, and standard deviation for the positive dimension. It did not, however, permit significant variation in the cumulative totals. Although originally generated as "satisfiers," these four items scoring in the neutral range had been sorted more than 50% of the time into the "neutral" or "has nothing to do with satisfaction" categories. This second testing

appears to confirm their minimal effect on group member satisfaction.

Three more descriptive analyses were done. First, internal reliabilities on the two original sets of items indicated that the satisfying items were less consistent than the dissatisfying items. Apparently, people "know" more specifically when they feel dissatisfied than when they feel satisfied in group interaction. This may lead to a conceptualization of satisfaction as a less specific construct than dissatisfaction. Table 2 presents the internal reliabilities.

Table 2

Internal Reliabilities on the Original Item Sets

Dimension	Chronbach's Alpha
Situation 1 Dissatisfiers	.803
Situation 2 Dissatisfiers	.852
Situation 3 Dissatisfiers	.880
Situation 1 Satisfiers	.527
Situation 2 Satisfiers	.610
Situation 2 Satisfiers	.589

n = 40

Second, item-to-whole correlations were conducted. With this step, item-by-item variation in the cumulative total for both the satisfying and dissatisfying elements was identified. For the dissatisfaction items, item-to-whole correlations ranged from .019 to .839. For the satisfaction items, the range was from -.101 to .684. As expected on the satisfaction items, these correlations indicated that the neutral phrases identified earlier were the lowest correlating items.

Examination of item-to-whole correlations also provides evidence that items items vary across situations. Table 3 displays these data.

Table 3

Item-to-Whole Correlations

Dissatisfaction Item	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3	Code
2	.367	.445	.481	M
4	.283	.581	.742	S
6	.407	.586	.614	S
8	.346	.682	.650	S
10	.620	.692	.243*	S
12	.567	.552	.627	G
14	.535	.517	.628	G
16	.583	.674	.724	S
18	.775	.709	.762	G
20	.308	.095*	.019*	M
22	.732	.599	.736	S
24	.402	.438	.621	S
26	.580	.544	.839	S
28	.556	.465	.631	S
29	.739	.694	.722	G
30	.471	.594	.615	S
31	.382	.618	.724	S
32	.304	.533	.532	M

all items significant at $\leq$ .05 except those marked with *

Satisfaction Item	Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3	Code
1	.543	.390	.618	S
3	.492	.545	.511	M
5	.471	.478	.431	M
7	.142*	.357	.344	M
9	.386	.365	.242*	M
11	.175*	.127*	-.101*	M
13	.453	.667	.566	S
15	.395	.319	.345	M
17	.593	.172*	.536	M
19	.511	.598	.485	M
21	.628	.717	.670	G
23	.493	.416	.372	M
25	.517	.504	.579	M
27	.531	.513	.684	G

all items significant at $\leq$ .05 except those marked with *

n = 40

G = global effect; M = minimal effect; S = situational effect

Third, item-to-item correlations revealed a set of dissatisfiers that correlated with each other at the .6 level or better. These 12 items (2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 18, 24, 26, 29, 30, and 31) were extracted in hopes of defining a more discriminating dissatisfaction scale. The reliabilities of this subset of dissatisfaction items are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Internal Reliabilities of 12-Item Dissatisfaction Scale

New Dissatisfaction Dimension	Chronbach's Alpha
Situation 1	.741
Situation 2	.848
Situation 3	.896

This new dissatisfaction dimension did not produce overall better internal reliabilities than the entire dissatisfaction scale.

Backward elimination regression procedures did shed evidence that this set of items did account for significant variance in the total dissatisfaction scale and some evidence that dissatisfaction items vary according to the situation. For situation one, items 2, 4, 12, 16, 18, 24, 26, and 29 accounted for 92.5% of the total dissatisfaction scale variance (8 of 18 items). For situation 2, items 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 18, 24, 26, and 31 accounted for 92.5% of the total dissatisfaction scale variance (9 of 18 items). In the third situation, items 4, 8, 12, 16, 18, 24, 26, 30, and 31 accounted for 96.6% of the total dissatisfaction scale variance (9 of 18 items). Each of these sets of items represent the best model at the .10 significance level. F values are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Regression Values for New Dissatisfaction Scale

Item Number	Overall F 47.75 Situation 1 F value	p	Overall F 41.18 Situation 2 F value	p	Overall F 95.87 Situation 3 F value	p
2	16.53	.0003	4.04	.0536		
4	18.21	.0002	7.67	.0095	8.98	.0054
6			6.56	.0157		
8			6.21	.0185	17.21	.0003
12	10.06	.0034	3.02	.0926	16.01	.0004
16	6.33	.0173			7.98	.0083
18	11.58	.0019	8.10	.0079	5.47	.0262
24	6.87	.0135	13.38	.0010	4.93	.0341
26	5.86	.0216	9.99	.0036	5.66	.0240
29	24.42	.0001	10.13	.0034		
30					13.57	.0009
31					4.62	.0397

Significance Level .0001

Interpretation of Situational Results

Using .6 as the cutoff criterion, some items appear to have a minimal or neutral effect on group member satisfaction. First, those 13 items that did not meet this criterion are coded "M" for minimal effect in Table 3. Second, 13 items had item-to-whole correlations that varied across the three situations with a correlation of .6 or greater in at least one of the three situations. These are coded "S" for situational in Table 3. Third, the code "G" is used to indicate the items that appear to have a global effect on the overall score. These items are correlated at the .6 level or above and appear more stable with less variation across situations.

Implication of Overall Results

Looking at the data generation process as a whole, these data confirm that the three variables identified by Heslin and Dunphy (1964) are important factors in group member satisfaction. Phrases implying status consensus, perceived progress toward group goal, and perceived freedom to participate were consistently sorted into the global satisfaction category. Phrases implying the opposite of these variables were more often categorized as situational. This may imply that people conceptualize satisfaction as a global factor and that dissatisfaction is more situationally bound.

The six factors contributing to satisfaction suggested by Marston and Hecht (1988) also surfaced in the data generated here. Their theoretical examination of the satisfaction construct still implies that dissatisfaction is the logical and numerical opposite of satisfaction. The baseline data generated here could provide an impetus to dislodge that general assumption.

These data also suggest that on the whole, satisfaction is a global attribute as long as the group is moving along in its expected direction. Far more global satisfiers (43) were identified than global dissatisfiers (27). Also, the greater variation identified in the dissatisfaction factors in the testing of the situational items may suggest that researchers need to consider a two-step approach to measuring group member satisfaction. One step would consist of global satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Items from the data generated here that were sorted 70% of the time or more into satisfiers or dissatisfiers

would be good candidates for items to make up the global portion of a satisfaction measuring instrument. The second step would be to measure satisfaction and dissatisfaction as it pertains to a particular group interaction context. Those items that appear situational could be the base for generating a set of items for a particular group. Here, subjects could check off from a list those satisfiers and dissatisfiers they thought were contributing to or detracting from the group experience. Comparison of checklists among group members might provide further insight into what behaviors or which particular members were encouraging or inhibiting group interaction.

Further testing of this nature would allow us to construct a set of situational satisfiers and dissatisfiers. This type of measurement would respond to Hecht's (1978a) request to consider group member satisfaction situationally. The type of data generation used in this project is different than that used by Hecht (1978b). After generating baseline phrases, he asked subjects to rate each item on the degree to which the item described their ideal notions of satisfying and dissatisfying conversations. This procedure may have created a global measure of satisfaction and largely eliminated many situational elements. The data here suggest that different interactions produce differing feelings about satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Methodologically, these data also suggest that measuring procedures that accumulate points for satisfaction may be inappropriately measuring dissatisfaction when the scales for dissatisfiers are reversed and added to or subtracted from the

satisfaction total. Both the Com-Sat Inventory (Hecht, 1978a) and the Wall Satisfaction Questionnaire (Wall & Nolan, 1986) use this approach. In both of these instruments, a low dissatisfaction item is reversed and considered as an additive element to satisfaction. This is questionable. For example, reverse scoring of the "My enthusiasm to work with the group was low" item in the Wall Satisfaction Questionnaire contributes to the satisfaction total. No evidence is presented that having enthusiasm is the same as being satisfied or that not having enthusiasm is similar to dissatisfaction. It may very well be that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two separate variables and need to be measured independently. This is particularly true if further testing confirms that satisfaction is more global and dissatisfaction is more situational.

Last, these data suggest that people can identify satisfaction and dissatisfaction as behaviors. Many of these behaviors are specific to interaction or result from interaction. Some of the generated phrases include attitudinal statements, but for the most part, items refer to behaviors that can be observed and measured. Additional research should continue to specifically identify which behaviors contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction in group interaction.

The Next Step

Several suggestions are made for further testing of global and situational satisfiers and dissatisfiers. The global items should be measured in more group contexts to confirm their global nature. The same should be done for the situational items. In both cases, measurement should occur in real groups without

relying upon recalled or hypothetical interaction. The consistently sorted items generated here need to be refined and streamlined to achieve a set of items that could measure the global nature of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The situational items need the same refinement. Extreme caution should be exercised here, however, to avoid the past methodological assumptions that relieve the situational items of the interesting nature they bring to the measurement of the construct.

Second, as more item refinement occurs, further statistical analyses of data needs to confirm the proposed two-factor nature of satisfaction. It may be that dissatisfaction is the more interesting variable and that it has a larger effect on group interaction than satisfaction. This idea has been overlooked in past research.

Further investigation of these data could also suggest that a 2x2 matrix is underlying the construct called satisfaction. A matrix composed of cells labeled satisfaction-global, satisfaction-situational, dissatisfaction-global, and dissatisfaction-situational may help in determining the relationships among the global and situational items and the satisfaction and dissatisfaction items. If satisfaction is more global in nature, and is the expected norm of group interaction, then it might be the case that only a few dissatisfying behaviors may change a group member's global conceptualization and feelings of satisfaction. How the two concepts--satisfaction and dissatisfaction--are weighted has been ignored in previous

. research.

The baseline data generated in this project can provide the initial elements in developing measuring instruments to aid in identifying, defining, and explaining group member satisfaction and dissatisfaction. An expanded perspective which allows our standard conceptualization of satisfaction to be temporarily split into separate factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction will encourage more thorough investigation of both constructs.

Appendix A

Com-Sat Inventory

1. The other person let me know that I was communicating effectively.
2. Nothing was accomplished.*
3. I would like to have another conversation like this one.*
4. The other person genuinely wanted to get to know me.
5. I was very dissatisfied with the conversation.*
6. I had something else to do.
7. I felt that during the conversation I was able to present myself as I wanted the other person to view me.
8. The other person showed me that he/she understood what I said.
9. I was very satisfied with the conversation.*
10. The other person expressed a lot of interest in what I had to say.
11. I did not enjoy the conversation.*
12. The other person did not provide support for what he/she was saying.
13. I felt I could talk about anything with the other person.
14. We got to say what we wanted.
15. I felt that we could laugh easily together.
16. The conversation flowed smoothly.*
17. The other person changed the topic when his/her feelings were brought into the conversation.
18. The other person frequently said things which added little to the conversation.
19. We talked about something I was not interested in.

* = items that loaded on the first factor, general affect/morale.

source: Hecht, M. L. (1978b). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 4(3), 253-264.

Appendix B

Wall Satisfaction Questionnaire

1. I felt my ideas were stifled by the group.
2. My enthusiasm to work with the group was low.
3. I only stayed with my group because I had to do so.
4. I came away from most of my group meetings feeling resentful toward the group.
5. I would describe my amount of frustration, due to the behavior of other group members, as "very high".
6. Overall, I am satisfied with my group's performance for the project.
7. I am satisfied with the quality of my group's work.
8. I came away from most of my group's meetings feeling good about our work.
9. Overall, I would describe my interactions with other group members as "very satisfying".
10. I am very frustrated with the quality of my group's work.

source: Wall, V. D., Jr., & Nolan, L. L. (1986). Perceptions of inequity, satisfaction and conflict in task oriented groups. Human Relations, 39(11), 1033-1052.

Appendix C

Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Phrases
and their Sorting Frequencies

SATISFIERS

At least 90% sorted these statements as satisfying them in group situations

My group members are hard workers.

The attitudes of group members are good.

My group develops good and useful ideas.

Group members actively participate in what's going on in the group.

The group workload seems equally distributed.

Everyone seems genuinely interested in getting something accomplished.

Each group member is striving to improve the group's interaction.

Group members get along well with one another.

Group members make suggestions to keep the group on track.

The group is accomplishing our goals.

Our group spends its time well.

Group members can provide constructive criticism to others.

Members of my group take the views of others into consideration.

My group works well together.

Group members do the tasks that they are supposed to do.

Each group member is doing their share of the work.

I feel good about our group activity.

Everyone in my group understands what is going on.

Group members are working hard to achieve the group goal.

Everyone in the group is willing to work.

Group members interact well with one another.

--continued--

Group members are concerned with accomplishing group goals.

I feel comfortable in my group.

My group is making progress toward our goals.

Group members take into account the feelings and thoughts of everyone in the group.

I feel that my group is really accomplishing something.

At least 80% sorted these statements as satisfying them in group situations

Group members are able to express themselves freely and clearly.

My group's leadership is just right.

Our group topic/project/purpose is acceptable to everyone in the group.

The group is dealing with the leadership issue well.

Everyone attends each group meeting.

Group members are generating a bond by having the same goals.

My group is staying on track with our schedule and purpose.

My group has the right amount of input.

All group members are contributing.

All group members cooperate with one another.

None of my group members have a bad attitude toward the group.

Group members put in extra time when it is necessary.

As a group, we like one another.

At least 70% sorted these statements as satisfying them in group situations

I like the other members of my group.

Everyone is participating in the group discussion.

My group has a good time; we can laugh and joke at our mistakes.

Group members have a sense of how the group is performing.

--continued--

DISSATISFIERS

At least 90% sorted these statements as dissatisfying them in group situations

Some of my group members are close-minded to others' suggestions.

Group members spend too much time playing around or goofing off.

It is difficult to send and receive messages in the group.

My group isn't very efficient.

I am confused about exactly what direction the group is going.

My group has conflicts that arise from our lack of organization.

I feel like my group is getting nowhere.

At least 80% sorted these statements as dissatisfying them in group situations

My group is having trouble interacting.

It's frustrating when my group works but gets little done.

My group spends a lot of our time being confused.

My group gets sidetracked by distractions.

I feel frustrated because my group is expending time and effort, but I can't see the results.

My group lacks organization.

There is a great deal of confusion in my group.

We are unclear about our objectives.

My group members have little patience.

While a group discussion is going on, other group members have side conversations.

I feel confused about the goal or purpose of my group.

Distractions in the group has shortened the time the group has to concentrate on its project.

--continued--

At least 70% sorted these statements as dissatisfying them in group situations

My group gets sidetracked on trivial matters.

Not everyone in the group is participating.

The individual effort given by group members is not adding up to the total group effort needed to accomplish our goals.

It is difficult for my group to come to a decision.

My group is not as organized as I would like it to be.

In group discussions, individual contributions are somehow lost in the shuffle.

My group takes a long time to make a little progress toward our goal.

In group discussions, group members often interrupt one another.

Appendix D

Situational Items
Originally classified as SATISFIERS

At least 30% sorted these statements into the "neutral" or "has nothing to do with group satisfaction" piles.

sat=satisfies in group situations
dis=dissatisfies in group situations
neu=neutral; could satisfy or dissatisfy
not=has nothing to do with group satisfaction

		Sorting Distribution			
Item		sat	dis	neu	not
1	There is a diversity of ideas among my group members.	28	1	18	3
3	My group is relaxed and not uptight.	33	0	13	4
5	My group members are intelligent.	34	0	5	11
7	A group leader has emerged.	22	1	22	5
9	Group members don't want to risk damaging the cohesiveness of the group.	9	10	25	6
11	One member has not been designated as the leader; leadership is shared.	18	4	26	2
13	The individual personalities of the group members do not clash.	24	1	16	9
15	The other group members are different from me.	12	3	24	11
17	The other group members bring different priorities and perspectives to the group.	20	3	24	3
19	My group members are accepting and not judgmental.	31	4	14	1
21	I feel equal to others in my group.	32	1	13	4
23	I feel free to do as I please within my group.	26	3	15	6
25	The size of my group is just right.	32	0	9	9

--continued--

Lost Sort Card

27 My group has a variety of input.

Situational Items
Originally classified as DISSATISFIERS

At least 30% sorted these statements into the "neutral" or "has nothing to do with group satisfaction" piles.

sat=satisfies in group situations
dis=dissatisfies in group situations
neu=neutral; could satisfy or dissatisfy
not=has nothing to do with group satisfaction

Item		Sorting Distribution sat	dis	neu	not
22	My group has trouble coming to a firm decision; we often change our minds.	2	26	22	0
24	My group can come to an agreement, but getting there is frustrating.	4	14	30	2
26	My group is in an uproar.	1	28	15	6
28	Interaction roles have not been established.	0	30	17	3
29	Group members individually produce good ideas, but we have trouble acting on those ideas or getting the group to come to consensus on those ideas.	2	31	14	3
30	My group has a general direction, but not a specific target.	2	20	28	0
31	Several group members are trying to establish the same role (leader, follower).	1	23	24	2
32	There is no role diversity in my group.	2	25	20	3
2	There is competition about who will be the group leader.	5	20	23	2
4	My group has too many people making the decisions.	0	23	25	2

--continued--

6	My group takes too long to come to an agreement.	0	31	18	1
8	Group members have a tendency to talk at the same time.	0	33	11	6
10	The number of people in my group is wrong for the type of goals we have set.	0	24	14	12
12	It takes my group a good while to decide on an issue.	2	20	27	1
14	Some individual(s) in the group want to change after the group has come to a decision.	0	31	18	1

Lost Sort Card

16 My group is confused about the expectations of the person(s) judging or evaluating our performance/output.

These two items do not fit into any of the previous sorting categories.

18	Group members know what is supposed to be happening, but acting or carrying out effective group process is difficult for us to do.	2	34	11	3
20	My group needs discipline and order.	6	32	12	0

Appendix E

Situations Expected to Vary Group Satisfaction

Situation 1:

You are a member of 5 person group whose task is to decide how to spend the $5,000 left over in your organization's budget. While the other members of the group are each an officer of the organization, you were asked to join the committee to represent the membership of the larger organization. You've been a member of this group for some time and expect to continue your membership in the future. In other words, you are committed to this group. You know the other group members; you all are on a first name basis.

Situation 2:

You've been asked to serve on a neighborhood action group. It seems that your neighborhood has been lacking in city services recently and your neighbors are concerned that their voices are not being heard at City Hall. You're surprised at their invitation for you to join them. You moved into the neighborhood only a few months ago and really don't know anyone very well. You're not even sure of their names or where these people live. Your neighbors believe, however, that you will make a good addition to the group because of your professional position. The group only expects to have meet three or four times.

Situation 3

You have been asked by your supervisor to be part of a city-wide committee for a local charity. You will be working with others who have been appointed by their organizations. Your first meeting is today; you've seen a list of the committee members and you don't recognize anyone's name. Your group will meet once a week for the next six weeks to prepare a final report to the charity organization.

Gouran, D. S. Correlates of member satisfaction in group decision-making discussions. Central States Speech Journal, 24(2), 91-96.

Hecht, M. L. (1978a). Measures of communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 4(4), 350-368.

Hecht, M. L. (1978b). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 4(3), 253-264.

Hecht, M. L. (1978c). Toward a conceptualization of communication satisfaction. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64(1), 47-62.

Hecht, M. L. (1984). Satisfying communication and relationship labels: Intimacy and length of relationship as perceptual frames of naturalistic conversations. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48(3), 201-216.

Heslin, R., & Dunphy, D. (1964). Three dimensions of member satisfaction in small groups. Human Relations, 17, 99-112.

Hrycenko, I., & Minton, H. L. (1974). Internal-external control, power position, and satisfaction in task-oriented groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30 (6), 871-878.

Keyton, J. (1987). An examination of the compatibility and effectiveness of self-selected small task groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

.. .. Marston, P. J., & Hecht, M. L. Group satisfaction. In R. S. Cathcart & L. A. Samovar (Eds.), Small Group Communication: A Reader (pp. 236-246). Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Wall, V. D., Jr., & Galanes, G. J. (1986). The SYMLOG dimensions and small group conflict. The Central States Speech Journal, 37(2), 61-78.

Wall, V. D., Jr., Galanes, G. J., & Love, S. B. (1987). Small, task-oriented groups: Conflict, conflict management, satisfaction, and decision quality. Small Group Behavior, 18(1), 31-55.

Wall, V. D., Jr., & Nolan, L. L. (1986). Perceptions of inequity, satisfaction and conflict in task oriented groups. Human Relations, 39(11), 1033-1052.

Wall, V. D., Jr., & Nolan, L. L. (1987). Small group conflict: A look at equity, satisfaction, and styles of conflict management. Small Group Behavior, 18(2), 188-211.